

DETAILED ACTION

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with atty. Rob Phillips on 07/02/2009. The examiner had consulted with SPE Peter Vo on 06-25-2009. The applicant had amended a printer printing a receipt upon dispensing the remote device, but this did not interact with the other claim limitations or contribute much to the game as a whole. The examiner called atty. Rob Phillip on 06-25-2009 discussing these concerns on the part of the examiner. Mr. Phillips submitted preliminary amendments to this effect, which were entered 06-29-2009. The examiner verbally received permission from atty. Rob Phillips to remove "bank" from claim 81 on 07-02-2009. Neither the claims nor specification pertain to bank-issued debit or credit cards.

The application has been amended as follows:

81. (currently amended) The system of claim 80 wherein said dispenser includes at least one device selected from the following group of devices: (a) bill validator operable

Art Unit: 3714

to accept monetary consideration for dispensing said at least one gaming device, (b) card reader operable to read a player club card, (c) [[bank]] card reader operable to transfer credits and/or debits from and/or to a player's account, (d) currency dispenser operable to pay a player an account balance, (e) printer operable to print a sales receipt and (f) barcode reader operable to read a barcode on a sales receipt.

Reasons for Allowance

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: Franchi ('633), the base reference, has plural bidirectional communications channels (RF transmission and reception while the portable RSAT unit is being carried around the casino by the player, and communication via the RSAT holder, Cols. 15 & 18). Franchi, however, does not pertain to printing on a receipt, each time a gaming device is dispensed, an encryption key which can be manually entered by a player in the event of a transmission failure, the encryption key being used for subsequent communication between the dispensed gaming device and the controller. Angell ('672), the most notable secondary reference, has a wireless gaming devices in encrypted communication with a controller, but does not pertain to a self-service dispenser as in independent claim 80. '672 also does not suggest printing on a receipt, each time a gaming device is dispensed, an encryption key which can be manually entered by a player in the event of a transmission failure, the encryption key being used for subsequent communication between the dispensed gaming device and the controller, as newly claimed. Zach ('582), another secondary reference, (108, Fig. 1, 5:52-6:6)

Art Unit: 3714

uses a random number for encryption between a controller and a gaming terminal, but does not pertain to portable dispensed gaming devices, using plural communications channels as claimed, and similarly does not pertain to the newly cited limitations of printing on a receipt, each time a gaming device is dispensed, an encryption key which can be manually entered by a player in the event of a transmission failure, the encryption key being used for subsequent communication between the dispensed gaming device and the controller. The newly claimed limitations in conjunction with the rest of Claim 80 have the advantage of allowing the player to continue playing in the event the key is not transmitted to the gaming device (pages 23 & 24, specification). The random encryption key is generated on each dispensing of the gaming device, which is critical to the claim as a whole, as the claim is ensuring secure communications between the remote gaming device and the central controller. The use of the random encryption key is not one-time; it is used both to transmit wagering requests from the remote device to the central controller, and to transmit wagering results from the central controller to the remote device. This limitation is tied to the physical structure of the dispenser (the printer) and the remote gaming device (manual input), facilitating communication between both of these devices and allowing the player to continue playing in the event of a transmission failure.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on

Art Unit: 3714

Statement of Reasons for Allowance.” The examiner respects that the applicants may have different reasons for allowance.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cote, et al. in U.S. patent 7,008,317 B2 teach a ticket with a key on it. Silverbrook, et al. in U.S. patent 6,835,135 B1 teach a gaming device that prints. Chamberlain, et al. in U.S. patent 6,752,312 B1 teach a gaming device with a printer. Kanoh, et al. in U.S. patent 5,934,439 A teach a renting/dispensing system. Werdio, et al. in U.S. patent 5,655,966 A teach portable gaming devices. Gimmon in U.S. patent 5,096,195 A teaches dispensing gaming devices. Cote, et al. in U.S. pre-grant publication 2002/0090986 A1 teach a ticket with a code printed on it. Miller, et al. in U.S. patent 6,354,941 B2 teach dispensing gaming devices. Gray, et al. in U.S. pre-grant publication 2004/0229677 A1 teach a ticket with a code printed on it. Fields in U.S. patent 6,769,991 B2 teaches portable gaming devices. Stern in U.S. patent 6,110,044 A teaches a ticket with a validation code. Schoeder, et al. in U.S. patent 5,791,990 A teach a ticket with a validation code.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew D. Hoel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5961. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri., 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

Art Unit: 3714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matthew D. Hoel
Patent Examiner
AU 3714

/Dmitry Suhol/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
3714

/M. D. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714